

THE PRIME NUMBER THEOREM ON THE NOSE

ALEX V. KONTOROVICH

ABSTRACT. The prime number theorem gives the following asymptotic for the n -th prime: $p_n \sim \text{iL}(n)$, where we are calling iL the inverse to the logarithmic integral function, Li . Let $\hat{\pi}(x)$ denote the number of primes $p \leq x$ with $p = \lfloor \text{iL}(n) \rfloor$ for some n . We say that these primes hit the value suggested by the prime number theorem “on the nose”. Using exponential sums, the method of stationary phase, and Vaughan-type identities, we show that $\hat{\pi}(x) \sim \frac{\text{Li}(x)^2}{x} \sim \frac{x}{\log^2 x}$ and interpret this fact as the independence of the process of the primes to their average value, iL .

1. INTRODUCTION

It is a folklore conjecture that any integer-valued function should contain infinitely many primes, so long as no devastating obstacle presents itself (for instance, it would be quite extraordinary if one could find many primes in the sequence $\{n^2 - 1\}$). Dirichlet answered this question completely in the case of lines, and none since has succeeded for a single higher-degree polynomial. Iwaniec [5] showed that there are infinitely many almost primes (numbers with at most two factors) in the sequence $\{n^2 + 1\}$ and similarly in any admissible one-variable quadratic polynomial. Allowing two variables, there are the famous results of Friedlander and Iwaniec [1] that there are infinitely many primes in $X^2 + Y^4$, and the corresponding theorem of Heath-Brown [4] for the even sparser polynomial $X^3 + 2Y^3$.

In the 1950's, Piatetski-Shapiro [8] gave an interpolation between Dirichlet's primes in arithmetic progressions and the higher degree case via the sequence $\{[n^c]\}$. Here $[x]$ is the integer part of x and c is any constant in some interval $[1, c_0)$. Clearly there are no primes when $c = 2$ but it is believed that $c_0 = 2$ is the correct upper bound. Piatetski-Shapiro succeeded with $c_0 = \frac{12}{11} \approx 1.0909\dots$, and then improvements of Kolesnik [7], Heath-Brown [3], and Rivat [9] (among many others) brought it to the current record, $c_0 = \frac{2817}{2426} \approx 1.1612\dots$ due to Rivat and Sargos [10].

The quantitative result is of course an asymptotic formula. Let $\pi_c(x)$ represent the number of primes $p \leq x$ with $p = [n^c]$ for some n . Then these theorems state that $\pi_c(x) \sim \frac{x^{1/c}}{\log x}$. While the common interpretation of Piatetski-Shapiro's theorem is an instance of primes in a higher order polynomial, we prefer to say that it demonstrates the independence of the exponential function n^c and the random process of the primes. More precisely, the fraction of c -th powers to all numbers up to x is roughly $\frac{x^{1/c}}{x}$ while the corresponding probability for primes is $\frac{1}{\log x}$. The

Date: February 2, 2008.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification. 11L07, 11L15, 11L20, 11C08, 11N32, 11N35, 11N36.

Key words and phrases. Exponential Sums, Sums over Primes, Piatetski-Shapiro Primes, Prime Number Theorem, Stationary Phase, Sieve Methods.

two events (hitting a prime or a c -th power) are independent if the probability of the intersection is the product of the fractions, namely $\frac{x^{1/c}}{x \log x}$. But this is nothing more than that corresponding asymptotic for the count, $\pi_c(x) \sim \frac{x^{1/c}}{\log x}$.

In the present work we are concerned not with improving the value of c_0 but with the opposite direction - decreasing the exponent down to a log. So we would like to find primes in the sequence $\{n \log n\}$. Actually, the Prime Number Theorem gives the asymptotic formula for the n -th prime, $p_n \sim \text{iL}(n)$ where we are (somewhat facetiously) calling iL the inverse to the logarithmic integral function,

$$\text{Li}(x) = \int_2^x \frac{dt}{\log t}.$$

The following expansion can be found for example in [12]:

$$\text{iL}(x) = x \log x + x \log \log x - x + x \frac{\log \log x - 2}{\log x} + \dots$$

Let $\hat{\pi}(x)$ denote the number of primes $p \leq x$ which hit the prime number theorem “on the nose”, $p = \lfloor \text{iL}(n) \rfloor$ for some integer n . Our main result is

Theorem 1.1. $\hat{\pi}(x) = \frac{\text{Li}(x)^2}{x} + O\left(\frac{x}{\log^3 x}\right) = \frac{x}{\log^2 x} + O\left(\frac{x}{\log^3 x}\right).$

Our interpretation is again that the sequence $\lfloor \text{iL}(n) \rfloor$ is independent of the process of the primes. This is our reason for choosing to write the first equality in Theorem 1.1. There is the same proportion of elements of $\lfloor \text{iL}(n) \rfloor$ and primes less than x , namely $\frac{\text{Li}(x)}{x}$. Multiplying these probabilities gives the fraction $\frac{\text{Li}(x)^2}{x^2}$ and the count for $\hat{\pi}(x)$ as above. In some sense, this is completely expected, but in another sense, it is a bit surprising - the process of the primes is independent of its average value.

The proof follows analogously to Piatetski-Shapiro’s and uses the techniques of estimating exponential sums. In the following section, we reduce the problem to an exponential sum over the primes. We devote the third section to breaking the sum into ones of Type I and Type II (as per Vaughan’s nomenclature) and estimating these individually, completing the proof of Theorem 1.1. We reserve the (tedious) calculations of the method of stationary phase and the necessary bound on Type II sums for the first two appendices. In the third appendix, we trivially extend our results to primes on the nose in arithmetic progressions.

2. REDUCTION TO EXPONENTIAL SUMS OVER PRIMES

We follow standard methods, which we include here for completeness. If $p = \lfloor \text{iL}(n) \rfloor$ then $p \leq \text{iL}(n) < p + 1$, or equivalently, $\text{Li}(p) \leq n < \text{Li}(p + 1)$. The existence of an integer in the interval $[\text{Li}(p), \text{Li}(p + 1))$ is indicated by the value $\lfloor \text{Li}(p + 1) \rfloor - \lfloor \text{Li}(p) \rfloor$, so we have

$$\hat{\pi}(x) = \sum_{p \leq x} (\lfloor \text{Li}(p + 1) \rfloor - \lfloor \text{Li}(p) \rfloor).$$

Write $\lfloor \theta \rfloor = \theta - \psi(\theta) - \frac{1}{2}$, where the shifted fractional part $\psi(\theta) = \{\theta\} - \frac{1}{2} \in [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$ has the standard truncated Fourier expansion: (see e.g. Theorem A.6 of [2])

$$\psi(\theta) = \sum_{0 < |h| \leq H} c_h e(\theta h) + O\left(\frac{1}{H}\right) \quad (2.1)$$

with $c_h \ll \frac{1}{h}$, and $e(x) = e^{2\pi i x}$. In the above, H is a parameter which we will choose later (we will eventually set $H = \log^2 N$).

So we have:

$$\hat{\pi}(x) = \sum_{p \leq x} (\text{Li}(p+1) - \text{Li}(p)) + \sum_{p \leq x} (\psi(\text{Li}(p)) - \psi(\text{Li}(p+1))).$$

Since $\text{Li}'(x) = \frac{1}{\log x}$, we use the Taylor expansion: $\text{Li}(p+1) = \text{Li}(p) + \frac{1}{\log p} + O(\frac{1}{p \log^2 p})$ to get:

$$\hat{\pi}(x) = \sum_{p \leq x} \frac{1}{\log p} + \sum_{p \leq x} (\psi(\text{Li}(p)) - \psi(\text{Li}(p+1))) + O(1).$$

By partial summation and the prime number theorem,

$$\sum_{p \leq x} \frac{1}{\log p} = \int_2^x \frac{d\pi(t)}{\log t} = \frac{\pi(x)}{\log x} + O\left(\int_2^x \frac{\pi(t)}{t \log^2 t} dt\right) = \frac{x}{\log^2 x} + O\left(\frac{x}{\log^3 x}\right).$$

Therefore it suffices to show that

$$\sum_{p \leq x} \psi(\text{Li}(p)) - \psi(\text{Li}(p+1)) \ll \frac{x}{\log^3 x}.$$

Equivalently, we require that:

$$\Sigma = \sum_{N < n \leq N_1 \leq 2N} \Lambda(n) (\psi(\text{Li}(n)) - \psi(\text{Li}(n+1))) \ll \frac{N}{\log^2 N}.$$

Using (2.1) we write the sum above as $\Sigma = \Sigma_1 + O(\Sigma_2)$ where

$$\Sigma_1 = \sum_n \Lambda(n) \sum_{0 < |h| \leq H} c_h (e(h \text{Li}(n)) - e(h \text{Li}(n+1)))$$

and

$$\Sigma_2 = \frac{1}{H} \sum_n \Lambda(n).$$

It is clear by the Prime Number Theorem that $\Sigma_2 \ll N/H$, so choosing $H = \log^2 N$ dispenses with the error.

On writing $\phi_h(x) = 1 - e(h(\text{Li}(x+1) - \text{Li}(x)))$ and by partial summation, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_1 &\ll \sum_{1 \leq h \leq H} h^{-1} \left| \sum_{N < n \leq N_1} \Lambda(n) \phi_h(n) e(h \text{Li}(n)) \right| \\ &\ll \sum_{1 \leq h \leq H} h^{-1} \left| \phi_h(N_1) \sum_{N < n \leq N_1} \Lambda(n) e(h \text{Li}(n)) \right| \\ &\quad + \int_N^{N_1} \sum_{1 \leq h \leq H} h^{-1} \left| \frac{\partial \phi_h(x)}{\partial x} \sum_{N < n \leq x} \Lambda(n) e(h \text{Li}(n)) \right| dx \\ &\ll \frac{1}{\log N} \max_{N_2 \leq 2N} \sum_{1 \leq h \leq H} \left| \sum_{N < n \leq N_2} \Lambda(n) e(h \text{Li}(n)) \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Here we used the bounds

$$\phi_h(x) \ll h(\text{Li}(x+1) - \text{Li}(x)) \ll \frac{h}{\log N}$$

and

$$\frac{\partial \phi_h(x)}{\partial x} \ll h \left(\frac{1}{\log(x+1)} - \frac{1}{\log(x)} \right) \ll \frac{h}{N \log^2 N}$$

for $N \leq x \leq 2N$. We have thus reduced Theorem 1.1 to the estimate:

$$\sum_{0 < h \leq H} \left| \sum_{N < n \leq N_2 \leq 2N} \Lambda(n) e(h \text{Li}(n)) \right| \ll \frac{N}{\log N}, \quad (2.2)$$

which we prove in the next section.

3. VAUGHAN ESTIMATES

Our goal in this section is to demonstrate

Theorem 3.1. *The left hand side of (2.2) is $\ll N^{49/50+\epsilon}$.*

We now follow the outline of [2] Chapter 4.6. Fix u and v , parameters to be chosen later, and let $F(s) = \sum_{1 \leq n \leq v} \Lambda(n) n^{-s}$ and $M(s) = \sum_{1 \leq n \leq u} \mu(n) n^{-s}$. Notice, for instance that $\frac{\zeta'}{\zeta}(s) + F(s) = -\sum_{n > v} \Lambda(n) n^{-s}$. Comparing the Dirichlet coefficients on both sides of the identity

$$\frac{\zeta'}{\zeta} + F = \left(\frac{\zeta'}{\zeta} + F \right) (1 - \zeta M) + \zeta' M + \zeta F M$$

gives for $n > v$:

$$-\Lambda(n) = - \sum_{\substack{kl=n \\ k > v, l > u}} \Lambda(k) \sum_{\substack{d|l \\ d > u}} \mu(d) - \sum_{\substack{kl=n \\ l \leq u}} \log k \mu(l) + \sum_{\substack{klm=n \\ l \leq v, m \leq u}} 1 \cdot \Lambda(l) \mu(m)$$

Assume for now that $v \leq N$ (we will eventually set u and v to be slightly less than $\sqrt{N}$). Multiplying the above identity by $e(h \text{Li}(n))$ and summing over n gives:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{N < n \leq N_2 \leq 2N} \Lambda(n) e(h \text{Li}(n)) &= \sum_{u < l \leq N_2/v} \sum_{\substack{N/l \leq k \leq N_2/l \\ v < k}} \Lambda(k) a(l) e(h \text{Li}(kl)) \\ &\quad + \sum_{l \leq u} \sum_{N/l \leq k \leq N_2/l} \mu(l) \log k e(h \text{Li}(kl)) \\ &\quad - \sum_{r \leq uv} \sum_{N/r \leq k \leq N_2/r} b(r) e(h \text{Li}(kr)) \\ &= S_1 + S_2 - S_3, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$a(l) = \sum_{\substack{d|l \\ d > u}} \mu(d), \text{ and } b(r) = \sum_{\substack{lm=r \\ l \leq v, m \leq u}} \Lambda(l) \mu(m).$$

Notice that $|a(l)| \leq d(l)$ and similarly $|b(r)| \leq \sum_{d|r} \Lambda(d) = \log r$, so we have the estimates

$$\sum_{L < l \leq 2L} |a(l)|^2 \ll L \log^3 L, \text{ and } \sum_{R < r \leq 2R} |b(r)|^2 \ll R \log^2 R.$$

It now suffices to show that $\sum_{0 < h < H} |S_i| \ll N^{49/50+\epsilon}$ for each $i = 1, 2, 3$ by choosing u and v appropriately. We treat the sums of S_i individually in the next three subsections.

3.1. The sum S_2 . Recall that

$$\begin{aligned} S_2 &= \sum_{l \leq u} \mu(l) \sum_{N/l \leq k \leq N_2/l} \log k \, e(h \operatorname{Li}(kl)) \\ &\ll \sum_{l \leq u} \left(\sqrt{N} h + \int_{N/l}^{N_2/l} \frac{1}{x} \sqrt{x} h l dx \right) \\ &\ll \sqrt{N} h u. \end{aligned}$$

by partial summation and Lemma A.1. Thus $\sum_{1 \leq h < H} |S_2| \ll N^{49/50+\epsilon}$ (as desired) on taking $u = N^{12/25}$ and recalling that $H = \log^2 N$.

3.2. The sum S_1 . Rewrite S_1 and split it into $\ll \log^2 N$ sums of the form:

$$\begin{aligned} S_1 &= \sum_{\substack{N \leq kl \leq N_2 \\ v < k, u < l}} \alpha(k) \beta(l) e(h \operatorname{Li}(kl)) \\ &\ll \log^2 N \sum_{L < l \leq 2L} \sum_{\substack{K < k \leq 2K \\ N < kl \leq N_2}} \alpha(k) \beta(l) e(h \operatorname{Li}(kl)). \end{aligned}$$

The roles of k and l are essentially symmetric (allowing α and β to be either Λ or a will not affect the final estimate) and taking $v = u$, we may arrange it so $N^{12/25} \leq K \leq N^{1/2}$ and $N^{1/2} \leq L \leq N^{13/25}$.

Now using Lemma B.2, we find that:

$$\begin{aligned} S_1 &\ll \log^2 N \left(K L^{12/13} h^{\frac{1}{26}} \log^2 L \log^2 K \right) \\ &\ll \log^6 N \left(N^{49/50} h^{1/26} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Thus $\sum_h |S_1| \ll N^{49/50} \log^{14} N$ as desired.

3.3. The sum S_3 . Recall S_3 and break it according to:

$$\begin{aligned} S_3 &= \sum_{r \leq uv} b(r) \sum_{N/r \leq k \leq N_2/r} e(h \operatorname{Li}(kr)) \\ &= \sum_{r \leq u} + \sum_{u < r \leq uv} \\ &= S_4 + S_5. \end{aligned}$$

We treat S_4 exactly as S_2 , getting $S_4 \ll \sqrt{N} h u \log u$, which is clearly sufficiently small.

For S_5 , the analysis is identical to that of S_1 and gives the same estimate, so we are done.

4. NUMERICAL INVESTIGATIONS

Despite our colloquial use of “on the nose”, we should point out that $p = \lfloor \text{iL}(n) \rfloor$ need not be the n -th prime; indeed most of the time this cannot be the case. Consider the following table, containing the primes on the nose less than 1500, where we show values of k and n such that the k -th prime, $p_k = \lfloor \text{iL}(n) \rfloor$. (A caveat for those looking to reproduce the table below: Mathematica’s LogIntegral function is actually $\text{li}(x) = \int_0^x dt/\log t$; one must subtract $\text{li}(2)$ before using something like FindRoot to compute iL.) Notice that since $\pi(x) < \text{Li}(x)$ for the first many values of x (in fact for all values of x less than the first Skewes number, known to be at most 1.39×10^{316} , see e.g. [13]), it is impossible for $p_n = \lfloor \text{iL}(n) \rfloor$ in this range (not counting $k = 3, 4$). We have also included the values of $\text{Li}(p)$ and $1/\log p$ in the table to point out that a prime on the nose occurs only when the value of $\text{Li}(p)$ is just less than an integer, by no more than $1/\log p \approx \text{Li}(p+1) - \text{Li}(p)$.

5. CONCLUSION

As a result of the current investigation, the author became interested in the following question. Can one obtain a lower bound for the, say, Lebesgue measure of the set of $t \leq x$ for which $|\pi(t) - \text{Li}(t)| \leq c\sqrt{t}$? An affirmative answer would say that the Riemann Hypothesis is true for a positive proportion of values. This question should be somewhat analogous to Selberg’s theorem that a positive proportion of the zeros of the Riemann Zeta Function lie on the critical line, though the author is not aware of a way to relate the two statements. It may provide an alternate to Density Theorems in applications. Another direction of further research is to attempt a theorem along the lines of Green-Tao to find three-term (or longer) arithmetic progressions of primes on the nose. Lastly, we also hope to follow Goldston-Yildirim and show that there are small gaps between primes on the nose and primes. In particular, we conjecture that there are infinitely many primes on the nose, $p = \lfloor \text{iL}(n) \rfloor$, such that $p+2$ is prime. (Of course, the smallest gap between two primes on the nose is $\log n$, since this is the gap in the function $\text{iL}(n)$.) We hope to pursue these matters in the future.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The idea for this work spawned during a conversation with Peter Sarnak. He has always been generous with his time and support, and I am grateful for his advice. Many thanks are also due to Dorian Goldfeld and Patrick Gallagher for enlightening conversations and support, and to Steven J. Miller and Timothy D. Browning for helpful remarks and corrections. Part of this work was written up while visiting Niki Jacobs and Adam Good, and I am forever indebted for their hospitality.

k	n	p_k	$iL(n)$	$Li(p_k)$	$Li(p_k + 1)$	$1/\log p_k$
3	3	5	5.687	2.589	3.177	0.621
4	4	7	7.572	3.711	4.208	0.513
7	8	17	17.48	7.831	8.18	0.352
9	10	23	23.508	9.838	10.155	0.318
12	14	37	37.099	13.972	14.248	0.276
30	32	113	113.632	31.866	32.077	0.211
33	37	137	137.791	36.839	37.042	0.203
37	41	157	157.769	40.847	41.045	0.197
39	43	167	167.955	42.813	43.008	0.195
40	44	173	173.094	43.981	44.175	0.194
44	48	193	193.94	47.821	48.011	0.19
46	49	199	199.221	48.958	49.147	0.188
60	64	281	281.348	63.938	64.115	0.177
74	80	373	373.946	79.84	80.008	0.168
75	81	379	379.878	80.852	81.02	0.168
78	84	397	397.767	83.871	84.038	0.167
80	86	409	409.769	85.872	86.038	0.166
82	88	421	421.829	87.862	88.028	0.165
84	90	433	433.947	89.843	90.008	0.164
106	113	577	577.032	112.994	113.152	0.157
116	123	641	641.145	122.977	123.132	0.154
118	124	647	647.614	123.905	124.059	0.154
122	128	673	673.586	127.909	128.063	0.153
128	135	719	719.407	134.938	135.09	0.152
131	138	739	739.183	137.972	138.123	0.151
146	153	839	839.235	152.964	153.113	0.148
149	156	859	859.469	155.93	156.078	0.148
160	168	941	941.096	167.985	168.131	0.146
161	169	947	947.946	168.861	169.007	0.145
169	178	1009	1009.923	177.866	178.011	0.144
177	184	1051	1051.55	183.92	184.064	0.143
183	190	1093	1093.416	189.94	190.083	0.142
192	200	1163	1163.701	199.9	200.042	0.141
198	207	1213	1213.264	206.962	207.103	0.14
206	216	1277	1277.407	215.943	216.082	0.139
210	218	1291	1291.723	217.898	218.038	0.139
217	223	1327	1327.61	222.915	223.054	0.139
222	233	1399	1399.789	232.891	233.029	0.138
236	245	1487	1487.084	244.988	245.125	0.136

APPENDIX A. STATIONARY PHASE

We require the following estimate.

Lemma A.1. *For any integer $k \geq 1$,*

$$\sum_{N < n \leq N_1 \leq 2N} e(h \operatorname{Li}(nk)) \ll \begin{cases} N & \text{if } h = 0 \\ \frac{(N|h|k)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\log(Nk)} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Proof. The trivial estimate is $\ll N$. Assume without loss of generality $h > 0$. Let ψ be a smooth cutoff function supported in $[1, 2)$. We apply Poisson summation and estimate by the method of stationary phase:

$$\sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \psi\left(\frac{n}{N}\right) e(h \operatorname{Li}(nk)) = \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} b_m,$$

where the Fourier coefficient

$$b_m = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \psi\left(\frac{x}{N}\right) e(h \operatorname{Li}(xk)) e(-xm) dx = N \int \psi(x) e(h \operatorname{Li}(N x k) - N x m) dx.$$

In general, in an integral of the form $I = \int \psi(x) e(\phi(x)) dx$ where ψ is essentially constant, the contribution to I is negligible except at the critical points of the phase, ϕ . At such a point, x_s , say, the contribution is $\psi(x_s) \sqrt{\frac{1}{\phi''(x_s)}} e(\phi(x_s))$. The unique stationary point in our situation is $x_s = \frac{1}{Nk} \exp(\frac{hk}{m})$, and the contribution to the integral is:

$$b_m \ll N \psi(x_s) \log(N x_s k) \sqrt{\frac{x_s}{h N k}} \ll \begin{cases} N \frac{hk}{m \sqrt{h N k}} & \text{if } \frac{hk}{\log(2Nk)} < m \leq \frac{hk}{\log(Nk)} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where the range of m is determined by the support of ψ : $1 \leq x_s < 2$. Thus the total contribution is

$$\sum_n \psi(n/N) e(h \operatorname{Li}(nk)) \ll (N h k)^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{m=\frac{hk}{\log(2Nk)}}^{\frac{hk}{\log(Nk)}} \frac{1}{m} \ll (N h k)^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{1}{\log(Nk)}.$$

□

APPENDIX B. ESTIMATING TYPE II SUMS

We first require the following estimate.

Lemma B.1. *For fixed integers $K < k \leq 2K$ and $1 \leq q < Q$ (where K and Q are some parameters) define following expression*

$$S_0(q; k) = \sum_{L < l \leq 2L} e(h(\operatorname{Li}(lk) - \operatorname{Li}(l(k+q)))). \quad (\text{B.1})$$

Then

$$S_0 \ll Q^{\frac{7}{6}} h^{\frac{1}{6}} L^{\frac{2}{3}}.$$

Proof. Recall [6] Corollary 8.5: Suppose that for $j = 2, 3$, some $C \geq 1$ and $F > 0$, we have a function f with well-behaved j -th derivatives - say f satisfies

$$\frac{F}{C} \leq \frac{x^j}{j!} |f^{(j)}(x)| \leq F \quad (\text{B.2})$$

for all $x \in [L, 2L]$. Then

$$\sum_{L < l \leq 2L} e(f(l)) \ll C F^{\frac{1}{6}} L^{\frac{1}{2}} \log 3L,$$

where the implied constant is absolute.

To apply this to our situation, consider $g_a(x) = \text{Li}(xa)$. Then:

$$\begin{aligned} g'_a(x) &= \frac{a}{\log(xa)}, \\ g''_a(x) &= \frac{-a}{x \log^2(xa)}, \\ g'''_a(x) &= \frac{a(\log(xa) + 2)}{x^2 \log^3(xa)}. \end{aligned}$$

Let us take $f(x) = h(g_k(x) - g_{k+q}(x))$ so that $S_0 = \sum_l e(f(l))$. By expanding with respect to k , we get:

$$\begin{aligned} f''(x) &= h \left(\frac{-k}{x \log^2(xk)} + \frac{k+q}{x \log^2(x(k+q))} \right) \\ &= h \left(q \frac{\log(xk) - 2}{x \log^3(xk)} + \frac{q_1^2 (6 - 2 \log(xk))}{2 kx \log^4(kx)} \right), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} f'''(x) &= h \left(\frac{k(\log(xk) + 2)}{x^2 \log^3(xk)} - \frac{(k+q)(\log(x(k+q)) + 2)}{x^2 \log^3(x(k+q))} \right) \\ &= h \left(q \frac{\log^2(xk) - 6}{x^2 \log^4(xk)} + \frac{q_2^2 (24 - 2 \log^2(kx))}{2 kx^2 \log^5(kx)} \right), \end{aligned}$$

for some $q_1, q_2 \in [0, q]$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{x^2}{2} |f''(x)| &\leq \frac{hQ}{2} \left(\frac{2L(\log(2Lk) - 2)}{\log^3(2Lk)} \right), \\ \frac{x^2}{2} |f''(x)| &\geq \frac{h}{2} \left(\frac{L(\log(Lk) - 2)}{\log^3(Lk)} \right), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{x^3}{6} |f'''(x)| &\leq \frac{hQ}{6} \left(2L \frac{\log^2(2Lk) - 6}{\log^4(2Lk)} \right), \\ \frac{x^3}{6} |f'''(x)| &\geq \frac{h}{6} \left(L \frac{\log^2(Lk) - 6}{\log^4(Lk)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

We can therefore apply [6] Corollary 8.5 taking $F = \frac{hQL}{\log^2(2Lk)}$ and $C = 12Q \frac{\log^2(Lk)}{\log^2(2Lk)}$. The result is the estimate:

$$S_0 \ll Q^{\frac{7}{6}} h^{\frac{1}{6}} L^{\frac{2}{3}},$$

as desired. □

We have used quite crude bounds here; certainly a tighter analysis will yield a better exponent. Nevertheless, the estimate in the previous Lemma suffices to control Type II sums as follows.

Lemma B.2. *Let $\alpha(l)$ and $\beta(k)$ be sequences of complex numbers supported in $(L, 2L]$ and $(K, 2K]$, respectively, and suppose that $\sum_l |\alpha(l)|^2 \ll L \log^A L$ and $\sum_k |\beta(k)|^2 \ll K \log^B K$. Then*

$$\sum_{L < l \leq 2L} \sum_{K < k \leq 2K} \alpha(l) \beta(k) e(h \operatorname{Li}(lk)) \ll KL^{12/13} h^{\frac{1}{26}} \log^{A/2} L \log^{B/2} K.$$

Proof. Let S denote the sum on the left hand side. By Cauchy-Schwartz,

$$|S|^2 \ll \sum_l |\alpha(l)|^2 \sum_l \left| \sum_k \beta(k) e(h \operatorname{Li}(lk)) \right|^2.$$

Let $Q \leq K$ be a parameter to be chosen later. Using the Weyl-Van der Corput inequality (e.g. [2] Lemma 2.5):

$$\left| \sum_{K < k \leq 2K} z_k \right|^2 \leq \frac{K+Q}{Q} \sum_{|q| < Q} \left(1 - \frac{|q|}{Q}\right) \sum_{K < k, k+q \leq 2K} z_k \bar{z}_{k+q}$$

and the supposed estimates on the second moments of α and β , we get:

$$\begin{aligned} |S|^2 &\ll L \log^A L \frac{K+Q}{Q} \sum_{|q| < Q} \left(1 - \frac{|q|}{Q}\right) \\ &\quad \times \sum_l \sum_{K < k, k+q \leq 2K} \beta(k) \bar{\beta}(k+q) e(h(\operatorname{Li}(lk) - \operatorname{Li}(l(k+q)))) \\ &\ll L \log^A L \frac{K}{Q} \sum_{1 \leq |q| < Q} \sum_k |\beta(k) \bar{\beta}(k+q)| |S_0(q; k)| + \frac{K^2 L^2}{Q} \log^A L \log^B K, \end{aligned}$$

where S_0 is defined by (B.1).

Using Cauchy's inequality (that $|x\bar{y}| \leq \frac{1}{2}(|x|^2 + |y|^2)$) and the fact that $|S_0(q; k)| = |S_0(-q; k+q)|$, we get

$$|S|^2 \ll \frac{K^2 L^2}{Q} \log^A L \log^B K + \frac{LK}{Q} \log^A L \sum_k |\beta(k)|^2 \sum_{1 \leq q < Q} |S_0(q; k)|.$$

From Lemma B.1 we have the estimate:

$$\frac{1}{Q} \sum_{1 \leq q < Q} |S_0(q; k)| \ll Q^{\frac{7}{6}} h^{\frac{1}{6}} L^{\frac{2}{3}},$$

so we finally see that

$$|S|^2 \ll \frac{K^2 L^2}{Q} \log^A L \log^B K + L^{\frac{5}{3}} K^2 \log^A L \log^B K Q^{\frac{7}{6}} h^{\frac{1}{6}}.$$

The choice $Q = \lfloor L^{2/13} h^{-1/13} \rfloor$ gives the desired result. $\square$

APPENDIX C. PRIMES ON THE NOSE IN ARITHMETIC PROGRESSIONS

In this section, we show that

$$\hat{\pi}(x; q, a) = \sum_{\substack{p \leq x, p \equiv a \pmod{q} \\ p = \lfloor iL(n) \rfloor}} 1 = \frac{1}{\phi(q)} \frac{x}{\log^2 x} + O\left(\frac{x}{\log^3 x}\right),$$

for $(a, q) = 1$, as $x \rightarrow \infty$. Using

$$\frac{1}{\phi(q)} \sum_{\chi} \bar{\chi}(a) \chi(n) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } n \equiv a \pmod{q}, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where the sum is over all characters χ to the modulus q , we see that our goal is to demonstrate

$$\sum_{\chi} \bar{\chi}(a) \hat{\psi}(x; \chi) = \frac{x}{\log x} + O\left(\frac{x}{\log^2 x}\right),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\psi}(x; \chi) &= \sum_{n \leq x} \Lambda(n) \chi(n) (\lfloor \text{Li}(n+1) \rfloor - \lfloor \text{Li}(n) \rfloor) \\ &= \sum_n \Lambda(n) \chi(n) (\text{Li}(n+1) - \text{Li}(n)) - \sum_n \Lambda(n) \chi(n) (\psi(\text{Li}(n+1)) - \psi(\text{Li}(n))). \end{aligned}$$

Here again $\psi(x) = \{x\} - \frac{1}{2}$ is the shifted fractional part. Since $\chi(kl) = \chi(k)\chi(l)$ and $|\chi(n)| \leq 1$, the second sum is $O(\frac{x}{\log^2 x})$ by the same analysis as in the original problem. So we have

$$\hat{\psi}(x; \chi) = \sum_n \Lambda(n) \chi(n) \left(\frac{1}{\log n}\right) + O\left(\frac{x}{\log^2 x}\right).$$

When $\chi = \chi_0$ is the trivial character, we get $\hat{\psi}(x; \chi_0) = \frac{x}{\log x} + O(\frac{x}{\log^2 x})$ and this is the main contribution. There is no contribution to the main term from nontrivial characters, so we are done.

REFERENCES

- [1] Friedlander, J. B. and Iwaniec, H. “The polynomial $X^2 + Y^4$ captures its primes,” *Ann of Math (2)* **148** (1998), 963-1040.
- [2] Graham, S. W. and Kolesnik, G. *Van der Corput’s Method of Exponential Sums*, London Mathematical Society, Lecture Note Series **126**, 1991.
- [3] Heath-Brown, D. R. “The Pjateckiĭ-Šapiro Prime Number Theorem,” *J Number Theory* **16** (1983), 242-266.
- [4] Heath-Brown, D. R. “Primes represented by $x^3 + 2y^3$,” *Acta Math* **186** (2001), 1-84.
- [5] Iwaniec, H. “Almost-primes represented by quadratic polynomials,” *Invent Math* **47** (1978), 171-188.
- [6] Iwaniec, H. and Kowalski, E. *Analytic Number Theory*, American Math Society, Colloquium Publications **53**, 2004.
- [7] Kolesnik, G. A. “Primes of the form $[n^c]$,” *Pacific J Math* **118** (1985), 437-447.
- [8] Pjateckiĭ-Šapiro, I. I. “On the distribution of prime numbers in sequences of the form $[f(n)]$,” *Mat Sb* **33** (1953), 559-566.
- [9] Rivat, J. “Autour d’un theoreme de Pjateckiĭ-Šapiro: nombres premiers dans la suite $[n^c]$,” These de Doctorat. Paris: Univ de Paris-Sud, 1992.
- [10] Rivat, J. and Sargos, P. “Nombres premiers de la forme $[n^c]$,” *Canad J Math* **53** (2001), 414-433.
- [11] Titchmarsh, E. C. *The Theory of the Riemann Zeta-Function*, Oxford Univ. Press, London/New York, Oxford, 1951.
- [12] Weisstein, E. W. “Prime Formulas.” From *MathWorld* – A Wolfram Web Resource. <http://mathworld.wolfram.com/PrimeFormulas.html>. 2005.
- [13] Weisstein, E. W. “Skewes Number.” From *MathWorld* – A Wolfram Web Resource. <http://mathworld.wolfram.com/SkewesNumber.html>. 2005.

E-mail address: alexk@math.columbia.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY, NEW YORK, NY, 10027